

HONORABLE JAMES L. ROBERT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

No. C10-1823-JLR

MICROSOFT'S 9/10/12 MOTION TO
FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL

NOTED FOR:
Friday, September 21, 2012

MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Defendant.

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(g) and paragraphs 2(a) and 8 of the protective order entered in this case, Microsoft respectfully seeks leave to file under seal the following documents:

- (1) Limited Portions of Microsoft's Reply in Support of Its Rule 702 Motion to Preclude Testimony by Charles R. Donohoe and Dr. Ramamirtham Sukumar (Microsoft's "*Daubert* Reply"); and

MICROSOFT'S 9/10/12 MOTION TO FILE
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL - 1

No. C10-1823

LAW OFFICES
CALFO HARRIGAN LEYH & EAKES LLP
999 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 4400
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104
TEL., (206) 623-1700 FAX, (206) 623-8717

(2) Exhibits 6 and 7 to the Second Declaration of Christopher Wion in Support of Microsoft's Rule 702 Motion to Preclude Testimony by Charles R. Donohue and Dr. Ramamirtham Sukumar (the "9/10/12 Wion Declaration").

Microsoft seeks to file the foregoing materials under seal because they contain information that has been identified by either Microsoft or Motorola as confidential business information under the terms of the operative protective order issued in this case.

For these reasons, and as more fully described below, good cause exists for protecting the confidentiality of these documents. Microsoft respectfully requests permission to file the above-referenced documents under seal and that the Court direct such documents to remain under seal. Microsoft is filing a redacted version of its *Daubert* Reply as part of the public record.

II. FACTS & AUTHORITY

A. The Operative Protective Order and Applicable Court Rules Permit Microsoft to File Confidential Information under Seal.

Pursuant to the Protective Order issued by the Court on July 21, 2011, Microsoft is permitted to file materials designated by either party as Confidential Business Information¹ under seal, with such documents to remain under seal upon Court approval. Paragraphs 2(a) and 8 of the Protective Order govern the filing of documents under seal. Paragraph 2(a) provides:

Any information submitted in pre-trial discovery or in a pleading, motion, or response to a motion in this action, either voluntarily or pursuant to order, and which is asserted by a supplier to contain or constitute Confidential Business Information shall be so designated by such supplier in writing...and shall be segregated from other information being submitted. Documents shall be clearly and prominently marked on their face with the legend: "[SUPPLIER'S NAME] CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION, SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER" or a comparable notice. During the pre-trial phase of

¹ "Confidential Business Information" is defined in the parties' Protective Order as "information which has not been made public and which concerns or relates to the trade secrets, processes, operations, style of work, or apparatus, or to the production, sales, shipments, purchases, transfers, identification of customers, inventories, amounts or source of any income, profits, losses, or expenditures." Protective Order Regarding the Disclosure and Use of Discovery Materials (ECF No. 72), ¶1.

1 this action, such information, whether submitted in writing or in oral testimony,
2 shall be disclosed only *in camera* before the Court and shall be filed only under
3 seal, pursuant to Rule 5(g) of the Local Civil Rules of the United States District
4 Court for the Western District of Washington.

5 Paragraph 8 likewise provides that:

6 Any Confidential Business Information submitted to the Court in connection
7 with a motion or other proceeding within the purview of this action shall be
8 submitted under seal pursuant to paragraph 2 above.

9 *Id.*, at ¶ 8.

10 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recognize that courts may permit parties to file
11 “trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information” under
12 seal. Rule 26(c)(1)(G) and (H). District courts “are in the best position to weigh the fairly
13 competing needs and interests of the parties affected by discovery,” in crafting the appropriate
14 treatment of documents for which protected treatment is requested. *Seattle Times Co. v.*
15 *Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 36, 104 S. Ct. 2199 (1984); *see also Phillips v. General Motors Corp.*,
16 307 F.3d 1206, 1211-1212 (9th Cir. 2002).

17 Additionally, pursuant to Local Rule CR 5(g)(2), the Court may seal a document filed in
18 support of a non-dispositive motion upon a showing of good cause. Where the material sought to
19 be sealed “includes information about proprietary business operations, a company’s business
20 model or agreements with clients, there are compelling reasons to seal the material because
21 possible infringement of trade secrets outweighs the general public interest in understanding
22 the judicial process.” *Selling Source, LLC v. Red River Ventures, LLC*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
23 49664, 18 (D. Nev. Apr. 29, 2011).

24 Further, while the public generally enjoys a right to inspect and copy public records, “it
25 is uncontested ... that the right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute. Every court
has supervisory power over its own records and files, and access has been denied where court
files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes.” *Nixon v. Warner Communications,*
Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 598, 98 S. Ct. 1306 (1978). As the Court recognized, one such “improper

purpose” is where the commercial business information at issue is sought to be used as a “source[] of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Id.* (denying access to copies of tapes played at trial and noting that courts refused public access to their files where granting such access might “become a vehicle for improper purposes,” including causing a litigant competitive harm). Good cause exists to grant Microsoft’s motion to seal.

B. Good Cause Exists for Microsoft to File the Referenced Documents under Seal.

1. Exhibit 6 –Michael Dansky’s Deposition Transcript.

Exhibit 6 to the 9/10/12 Wion Declaration is a copy of the transcript from the September 5, 2012 deposition of Motorola’s expert, Michael Dansky. Microsoft has been informed that Motorola intends to designate the transcript as confidential under the Protective Order. At his deposition, Mr. Dansky testified regarding the content of his opening and rebuttal expert reports, which were both designated by Motorola as “Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only” under the terms of the Protective Order. Mr. Dansky also was examined regarding opinions offered by another Motorola expert, Charles R. Donohoe, whose expert reports were likewise designated as “Attorneys’ Eyes Only.” Mr. Dansky’s testimony and the expert reports referenced extensively throughout the course of his deposition disclose confidential and non-public financial and business information relating to both Microsoft and Motorola, and should be maintained under seal.

2. Exhibit 7 – Expert Report of Tim Williams.

Exhibit 7 to the 9/10/12 Wion Declaration is a copy of the July 24, 2012 opening report of Motorola’s expert, Tim Arthur Williams. Motorola did not designate Mr. Williams’ opening expert report as containing Confidential Business Information. However, Motorola did designate his deposition transcript and his rebuttal expert report as containing Confidential Business Information. Motorola has also informed Microsoft that Mr. Williams’ opening

1 report should be filed under seal. For these reasons, and because Mr. Williams' report
 2 discusses confidential, non-public information relating to the parties' patents that could
 3 potentially lead to competitive harm if disclosed publicly, Microsoft is filing Mr. Williams'
 4 opening report under seal.

5 3. Microsoft's *Daubert* Reply Includes References to Confidential Information
 6 Contained in the Above-Referenced Exhibits, which Should Be Redacted

7 Microsoft's *Daubert* Reply includes references to and descriptions of the confidential
 8 information contained in the above-referenced exhibits to the 9/10/12 Wion Declaration. To
 9 the extent that the Court determines that those exhibits should remain filed under seal,
 10 Microsoft's *Daubert* Reply should be redacted to avoid disclosure of the confidential
 11 information contained in those exhibits. Microsoft is seeking to file under seal only those
 12 limited portions of its *Daubert* Reply that contain information that should be protected from
 13 public disclosure under the governing standards outlined above. While a complete and
 14 unredacted version of the *Daubert* Reply is being filed under seal, Microsoft is filing a
 15 redacted version as part of the public record.

16 **III. CONCLUSION**

17 Microsoft has filed the above-referenced documents under seal in compliance with the
 18 terms of the Protective Order and the applicable Court rules. Nothing herein is intended as a
 19 waiver of Microsoft's right to contest Motorola's designation of material as Confidential
 20 Business Information in accordance with the terms of the Protective Order. Microsoft
 21 expressly reserves the right to do so as the circumstances warrant.

22 A [Proposed] Order Granting Microsoft's 9/10/12 Motion to File Documents Under
 23 Seal has been submitted herewith.
 24
 25

1 DATED this 10th day of September, 2012.

2 CALFO HARRIGAN LEYH & EAKES LLP

3
4 By s/ Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr.
Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., WSBA #1751
5 Christopher Wion, WSBA #33207
Shane P. Cramer, WSBA #35099

6
7 By T. Andrew Culbert
T. Andrew Culbert
8 David E. Killough
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
9 1 Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052
10 Phone: 425-882-8080
Fax: 425-869-1327

11
12 David T. Pritikin
Richard A. Cederroth
Constantine L. Trela, Jr.
13 William H. Baumgartner, Jr.
Ellen S. Robbins
14 Douglas I. Lewis
David C. Giardina
15 John W. McBride
16 David Greenfield

17 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
One South Dearborn
18 Chicago, IL 60603
Phone: 312-853-7000
19 Fax: 312-853-7036

20 Carter G. Phillips
21 Brian R. Nester

22 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street NW
23 Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: 202-736-8000
24 Fax: 202-736-8711

25 Counsel for Microsoft Corp.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Linda Bledsoe, swear under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington to the following:

1. I am over the age of 21 and not a party to this action.

2. On the 10th day of September, 2012, I caused the preceding document to be served on counsel of record in the following manner:

Attorneys for Motorola Solutions, Inc., and Motorola Mobility, Inc.:

Ralph Palumbo, WSBA #04751
Philip S. McCune, WSBA #21081
Lynn M. Engel, WSBA #21934
Summit Law Group
315 Fifth Ave. South, Suite 1000
Seattle, WA 98104-2682
Telephone: 206-676-7000
Email: Summit1823@summitlaw.com

____ Messenger
____ US Mail
____ Facsimile
 X ECF

Steven Pepe (*pro hac vice*)
Jesse J. Jenner (*pro hac vice*)
Ropes & Gray LLP
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-8704
Telephone: (212) 596-9046
Email: steven.pepe@ropesgray.com
Email: jesse.jenner@ropesgray.com

____ Messenger
____ US Mail
____ Facsimile
 X ECF

Norman H. Beamer (*pro hac vice*)
Ropes & Gray LLP
1900 University Avenue, 6th Floor
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2284
Telephone: (650) 617-4030
Email: norman.beamer@ropesgray.com

____ Messenger
____ US Mail
____ Facsimile
 X ECF

1 Paul M. Schoenhard (*pro hac vice*)

2 Ropes & Gray LLP

3 One Metro Center

4 700 12th Street NW, Suite 900

5 Washington, DC 20005-3948

6 Telephone: (202) 508-4693

7 Email: Paul.schoenhard@ropesgray.com

____ Messenger

____ US Mail

____ Facsimile

X ECF

8 DATED this 10th day of September, 2012.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

____ s/ Linda Bledsoe

LINDA BLEDSOE